



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 20, 2010

Ms. Cathy Cunningham
Boyle & Lowery, L.L.P.
4201 Wingren, Suite 108
Irving, Texas 75062-2763

OR2010-14291

Dear Ms. Cunningham:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 394091.

The City of Fate (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for (1) the city's contract with a named law firm, all e-mail correspondence relating to the contract and/or compensation arrangements for services rendered, and all e-mail correspondence related to negotiations for future contracts and/or compensation arrangements; (2) monthly billing statements from the named law firm during a specified time period; (3) e-mail correspondence between the named law firm and the city during a specified date; and (4) e-mail correspondence between the named law firm and the city relating to lobbyists, legislation, and legislators during a specified date. You state the city has released most of the responsive information. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body must provide the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative

is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Texas Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.*, meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Whether a communication is protected depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no pet.). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless the governmental body otherwise waives the privilege. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein). We note that communications with third party consultants with which a governmental body shares a privity of interest are protected. Open Records Decision Nos. 464 (1987), 429 (1985).

You state that the submitted information consists of communications between the city’s manager, a consultant, and outside attorneys representing the city made for the purpose of facilitating legal services. You state these communications were made in confidence and the city has maintained their confidentiality. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the submitted information constitutes privileged attorney-client communications the city may withhold under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tamara H. Holland". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Tamara H. Holland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

THH/em

Ref: ID# 394091

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)